

Illinois U Library

TOWN MEETING



January 8, 1956
Vol. 21, No. 37
904th Broadcast

"CONGRESSIONAL FORECAST FOR '56"

Speakers:

SEN. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

SEN. CLIFFORD P. CASE

REP. CARL ALBERT

REP. HALE BOGGS

REP. PATRICK J. HILLINGS

REP. HUGH SCOTT

Moderator:

GUNNAR BACK



Broadcast from the Senate
Radio Gallery, Washington

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast Sundays, ABC Network, 8 to 9 p.m., Eastern Time

"CONGRESSIONAL FORECAST FOR '56"

MR. BACK: This second session of the 84th Congress has been under way just short of a week. We have seen in the opening days the usual across-the-aisle pleasantries -- the bi-partisan cordiality that always are present when members meet after a long adjournment.

But, as one of my reporter friends put it in his opening day story -- "there was an opening veneer of bi-partisanship only partially screening the political battles that lie ahead."

What are these battles going to be? The President has sketched his program for this session in his State of the Union message, and members have had a day or so to look it over. It's a Republican program, of course, and the Democrats are expected to lose no time in hitting at it -- and they've begun to do so.

A few of the early signs are these: the old-time veteran, House Speaker Sam Rayburn of Texas has grumbled that the administration seems to have no foreign policy. His next in command, House Majority Leader MacCormack thinks this session, controlled by Democrats, has an obligation to expose the administration, as he puts it, for its big business philosophy to the detriment of small business.

On the Senate side, Democrat Senator Russell of Georgia calls the State Department so sterile of ideas that the only answer it has is to ask for more money. Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson calls the President's State of the Union message and program too general for any real planning by this session.

The Senate has already begun a sharp debate on the farm issue and, as always, in the background of this session is the big question coloring everything -- what are Mr. Eisenhower's plans about running for a second term?

But these are matters that can be better discussed by the six members of Congress who are to be heard tonight as we present on TOWN MEETING "CONGRESSIONAL FORECAST FOR '56."

New Jersey's Senator Clifford P. Case was a member of the House of Representatives from 1945 to 1953, leading the fight for civil rights and supporting the policy of military and economic aid to other democratic nations. Mr. Case served as president of the Fund for the Republic prior to his election to the Senate. A Republican, he is a member of the Committees on the District of Columbia, and Post Office and Civil Service. Welcome to TOWN MEETING, Senator Clifford Case!

SEN. CASE: Thank you, Mr. Back. It is always a pleasure to meet with my colleagues of the House and Senate and it is especially nice to do so on the TOWN MEETING program.

Our topic is a stimulating one. Personally, I've always found forecasting difficult -- particularly when it comes to forecasting what my fellow 95 Senators and 435 House members are likely to do. Usually I have made it my practice to limit forecasting to such safe predictions as that our ticket will win -- no matter what the election. Even then, I have sometimes been proved to be wrong.

The problem of forecasting this year is compounded because of the activity or perhaps I ought to say the lack of activity of the "do nothing" first session of this Congress. Most of the big issues on which President Eisenhower recommended action were delayed for this session. On this all legislators share responsibility, but I think it is fair to point out that it was the Democrats who controlled the Congress and the committees and the leadership. The result of that situation is that we are now faced with a veritable Sears, Roebuck catalog of legislation -- some of it most critical, and some of it terribly complicated. In addition, this huge pile has to be taken up in an election year, when members of Congress are itching to get out to the Presidential conventions and the campaigns. And, of course, the whole approach to legislation will necessarily be affected by the desire to leave the

The "Town Meeting Bulletin" is published weekly by The Town Hall, Inc. The text is compiled from a recording of the actual broadcast and the publisher is not responsible for the statements of the speakers. Subscription rates: \$5.00 per year; six months, \$3.00. Single copies, 25¢. Quantity rates on request. Address: "Town Meeting Bulletin," New York 36, New York.

best possible impression with the voters just before they go to the polls. Such far-reaching matters as revision of the tax structure may very well get boiled up in politics, instead of in logic.

Looking over the legislative situation, it is very helpful to have the guidance of President Eisenhower in his State of the Union message. It seems to me that he has given the nation a fine program, charting a route toward continued prosperity and peace. In several important respects, his message goes further than his previous ones.

Our activities this year in Congress will inevitably be the subject of much speech-making during the campaign period. The people of this country have demonstrated in their election of Mr. Eisenhower and in their continued support for him that they want enactment of his program. There have been those, in both parties, who have attempted to capitalize on his unusual popularity without sharing his legislative philosophy. The determination of how these people fare at the ballot box, in fact, how all of us fare, may very well depend on how much support we give the President this year. His recommendations will test whether individual legislators are really for his program, or are merely tendering lip service.

Some of these recommendations may be the subject of much debate, I know. For example, bills providing assistance to farmers, to communities in school construction, public housing, flood control, highways and disaster relief. There are many and varying approaches to these problems and further debate and consideration will be helpful in developing the most effective legislation.

In other fields, I think there will be much talk about how we can best use the taxpayers' dollars and here, too, there will be a lot of discussion -- helpful, I hope. On this list I put the appropriations bills, tax readjustments, Social Security revision, health programs, medical research, our defense program and perhaps most difficult and critical of all, foreign aid.

Also on the docket are plans for a rounded housing program, revision of our immigration and refugee laws, improvement of labor legislation, civil rights, highways, postal rates, regulation of transportation, and there are others too.

It's a formidable lineup, but not impossible. If we all really go to work and take a reasonable, non-dogmatic, non-doctrinaire approach, we can end up this session with a real record of progress. I hope it will be possible to do that.

MR. BACK: Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney of Wyoming has been a newspaper editor and is an attorney. He was first assistant postmaster general in 1934, when he was first elected to the Senate. He has been active in the Democratic Party since 1922, and in 1932 served as vice chairman of the party's National Campaign Committee. He is presently on the Senate Committees on the Judiciary and on Interior and Insular Affairs. Welcome, Senator O'Mahoney, to TOWN MEETING.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: Thank you, Mr. Back. I am always happy to be with you on any program.

I want to say at the outset that I hope this "veneer" of which you spoke on launching the program shall turn out to be much more than a veneer of bi-partisanship. The issues before this Congress are essentially bi-partisan, and any attempt by name-calling or by sarcasm or by clever remarks determine the problems that face the people of this country. These purely partisan attempts to win over the people for the election of 1956 will be a sad escape from the responsibility of the 1956 Congress.

It's too early to forecast what may be done, but it's easy to see that the leadership is terribly lacking. It's lacking in the Executive Branch -- it's lacking in the Legislative Branch -- because this Congress assembles without any definite program in the cold war that everybody knows to exist. We have seen the leaders of Soviet communism go to the Summit at Geneva, and from there to India and to Asia, where they have sought, and some believe successfully, in misrepresenting the policy of the United States. We have seen the position of Chiang Kai-shek become more questionable every day. We don't know what the policy of the Administration is with respect to China. We don't know what the program of Congress is with respect to China.

We know that in North Africa, in Egypt, in Israel, all through Asia, the situation in the strained relations between the United States and Soviet Russia have become dreadfully worse than they were four years ago. It's only necessary to refer to what happened in the United Nations when the United States was forced to observe the admission of Outer Mongolia as a member of the United Nations as though it were an independent nation, a self-governing nation and a peace-loving nation -- when we all know that it is not -- and we had to stand by and see the exclusion of Japan from the United Nations. Japan -- the great country which we conquered in the war and then after the war, under the leadership on the ground of General MacArthur, we established an economic policy which has made great progress for the people of Japan.

Now on the domestic scene. We've talked about the agricultural policy. I am reminded of the fact that three years ago we were told that the time had come to have a farm program ready for the termination of the 90% of parity law. The Dept. of Agriculture and Congress itself are both without programs. Three years have gone. Our leadership has not supplied a program and even after the reading of the State of the Union message last Thursday, Congress still is without knowledge of what the farm program will be. But we know, we, who are members of Congress, that the cold war is an economic war and an economic war must be fought by all of the people together and, I believe, by all of those of us who serve in government -- whether on the Executive side or on the Legislative side, because you cannot draw the line of partisan politics among small businessmen, among small farmers, among big farmers, among the leaders of industry. We know that we have no peace. We talk about peace, but we have no peace because we don't know what Soviet Russia is going to do tomorrow.

We talk about prosperity as though we had prosperity. Our prosperity is completely unstable -- as witness the fact that we have not balanced the budget; that we don't know when we will balance the budget, although we have cut our appropriations for defense to the bone. SAC -- it was the branch of the Air Force, designed to carry the weapons of modern warfare to the ends of the earth, has been seriously cut back. And yet we have a tax problem. I was very happy to have the President say, in his State of the Union message, that he proposed no tax reduction this year. I don't believe we can afford tax reductions while we are still undecided what we are going to do about defense expenditures. The Department of Defense has increased its estimate, according to the announcement which has been made, but we have not yet seen the budget figures. However, it's clear that we must work out leadership for the cold war, for the economic war in which we are now certainly engaged -- the economic war can be won only in the United States, in my opinion, by making certain that no branch of our economy shall suffer, and by showing all the peoples of the world that under a free American system we can live in peace and prosperity and without fear of what is going to happen tomorrow.

MR. BACK: Thank you, Senator O'Mahoney. I know that we've imposed -- knowing Congressmen -- a very trying silence on the other members of our panel. Let me now turn the discussion over to Senator Case for any comment he wishes to make on his colleague's remarks.

SEN. CASE: It seems to me that I could talk for a long time on the basis of these provocative comments, and always interesting and stimulating ones that my senior colleague in the Senate has made. I do mean the word "senior" in every way and I am most conscious of the superiority that he brings to us because of his long experience. But it does seem to me that I would like to make one general comment only at this time, because it isn't fair and the people who are listening to this program would not want me to do more. I don't disagree with many of the things that Senator O'Mahoney has said but the cold war is a tough thing -- it's going to last for a long time. Our foreign problem is a tough problem -- it's going to last for a long time. The only thing I do want to throw in here at this point is this word -- that I don't think, and I think no mature person thinks, that there is any single big gadget that can be discovered which, if discovered and applied, would put all

our problems at an end. We're grownup people and we live in a tough world and the question is not should we find some big single thing which is going to answer the foreign problem and the cold war and destroy communism forever, or answer the farm problem, which is one of keeping our agriculture strong, keeping the farmer in existence because he represents an important way of life in America -- keeping him free and at the same time being sure that he is as prosperous as possible. There isn't any single gadget for these things. I'll argue later, in detail, after other people have had a chance to talk as to whether we're doing, as I think we are, better than any previous administration and that the present leadership is extremely effective in all these fields.

MR. BACK: Now may I introduce the members of the House who are present here on our panel. Let me turn first to Congressman Patrick J. Hillings, Republican of California. He is a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary and House Administration. Congressman Hillings has recently returned from a tour of Western Europe, of the Soviet Union and five of the Communist satellite nations in connection with his work on the Committee on Communist Aggression. I am sure, Mr. Hillings, you have something to say on the scene as set so far.

REP. HILLINGS: My good friend, Senator O'Mahoney, of course, levelled a rather vigorous attack on the foreign policy which our country now follows, under President Eisenhower and his administration. I think our radio audience had an interesting example of bi-partisanship in that the Senator first of all talked about bi-partisanship and then launched into a bitter attack on our foreign policy.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: I beg your pardon. There was no bitterness in what I said.

REP. HILLINGS: I'm glad to have that corrected, Senator. In the first place, of course, the fact remains that we do have peace today. The world is at peace and when Senator O'Mahoney and some of the others here in the Congress today who supported the Truman and Roosevelt policies saw that a great portion of that time we had war. In addition to that fact, we watched country after country go to the Communists and today, of course, we are at peace and we know that no other country is going down the line to the Communists at the present time under the type of enlightened leadership we're giving the world under President Eisenhower.

And then on this question of prosperity which Senator O'Mahoney raised. You know, I think some of our Democrat friends actually go home at night and get down on their knees and say "Dear God, please don't let the country have prosperity as long as the Republicans are in power, because the Republicans are against the little man, the Republicans are against the people." Well, of course, that's strictly hog wash and today the average American is better off than he has ever been before and I wish some of our friends would quit trying to fool the American public into thinking that they don't have prosperity today, because we do. And I think those two issues -- peace and prosperity -- and the confidence in the type of leadership which the Eisenhower Republican Administration has given America are going to form the basis for the decision which will be made next November by the American people.

MR. BACK: Let's turn now to Carl Albert, Oklahoma Democrat. He has held a seat in the House since the 80th session in 1947. He is a member of the House Agricultural Committee. Congressman Albert!

REP. ALBERT: First of all, I would like to take issue with my good friend, Pat Hillings from California. We do have a large national income, but I think when we try to determine the prosperity, we're talking about something that is really synthetic prosperity. How can we have a genuine national prosperity when farm income has gone down every month since the Eisenhower Administration was elected? How can we talk about prosperity when we had an all-time record in the number of small businesses going broke during the past twelve months? How can we talk about the effectiveness of the present administration's farm program, as my friend, Senator Case, has indicated, when we find out that the administration now, at the very beginning of the last session of Congress to assemble under the present administration, has done a complete turn-about in its own farm program and has recommended, or we are told it has recommended a soil bank which was recommended by Democratic Congressman less

than eight months ago and which was turned down by the administration as being impractical, unrealistic and with the statement that the administration already had a program that was going to do the job for the farmers of this country. Now, the fact of the matter is that this approach to the agricultural problem that the administration is taking is new and it is not bi-partisan. The Secretary of Agriculture has already launched the program with a breakfast with the Republican members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and with the Republican members of the House Committee on Agriculture and so far as I have been able to find out, and I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture, not one single Democratic member of the Committee on Agriculture in either house of Congress has ever been consulted by a single representative of the present administration.

MR. BACK: Now let me turn to Congressman Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania.

REP. SCOTT: I'm interested in having a preview of an intelligent, constructive approach on the part of the Democratic leadership which is charged with responsibility for getting something through this Congress. This approach seems to consist of two points. First, that we have no foreign policy and, second, that we have no prosperity. The public surely will not be fooled by either of those two statements. The best foreign policy consists in keeping the peace. We are at peace -- we have the strongest national defense in peacetime. I've just returned as a part time naval officer from Pearl Harbor. We have a posture of complete readiness and awareness and a posture of determination in both our military preparedness and in our foreign policy planning to meet the Soviet at every point. We never had a better foreign policy and peace is the proof.

Now as to prosperity, two years ago we had something which was prosperity but which I believe Senator Douglas of Illinois called a depression, so we're apt to call that depression the "Douglas Depression." Now, I see that this particular prosperity, which I may add consists of the greatest per capita income in our history, the highest employment, the highest savings of people, the highest national income, the prospect of a balanced budget for the first time since the Republican 80th Congress and an enlightened program of the President meeting human needs has been labeled by Senator O'Mahoney as a depression. Now....

SEN. O'MAHONEY: I never used the word depression. You cannot use such terms and pretend to be indulging in an intelligent discussion.

REP. SCOTT: Senator, I think the public is the best judge of our respective intelligence. I am merely suggesting, since you assume that we have no prosperity in this country, I'll be glad for the so-called.....

MR. BACK: Gentlemen, shall we agree that Senator O'Mahoney did not use the word itself "depression" -- is that agreeable?

REP. SCOTT: What he said was that we do not have prosperity in this country.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: I said we have an unstable prosperity.

MR. BACK: At this point may I say that, as we forecast for '56, there certainly will be no lack of disagreement in this session. I'm going to ask Congressman Hale Boggs to speak. Congressman Boggs is a member of the House Ways and Means Committee and I think it's time to hear from you now, Mr. Boggs!

REP. BOOGGS: It seems to me that in all of these recommendations you have to look at the facts rather than the way they are dressed up. We have had this discussion about this dynamic administration and about the crusade, and so forth and so on, and I heard my good friend, Senator Case, talk about the "do nothing" first session of this 84th Congress. Let's take a look at the record, as Al Smith used to say. Number One, practically every program which was passed in the 84th Congress in the first session was a so-called bi-partisan program. Take, for instance, the President's recommendations with respect to foreign trade policies. On my committee on Ways and Means those recommendations were almost unanimously opposed by the members of his own party. The President is now recommending, in his State of the Union message, that we enter a general trade agreements' organization. I suspect that all of the Republican members of the committee will oppose that. If it's supported, it will be the result of the work of the Democratic members of that committee.

The same thing applies to so many of these other recommendations. I heard one of my good Republican friends refer to the President's program as dynamic conservatism -- yet he recommends a public housing program, a health program, extension of Social Security, extension of foreign aid, a highway program and a school program. A few years ago that wasn't called dynamic conservatism, that was called socialism. Apparently if the present administration can recommend it, it comes by a different name. But the interesting thing about all of these recommendations is that none of them are specific. Take the highway program, for instance. Everybody recognizes the need for a national highway program. The President, in his message, talked about a sound fiscal policy and he goes on and recommends a highway program, but there is not one word about how to finance that program. At least, they have abandoned this hokus-pokus deal which they tried to present last year to force upon the American people a revenue bond system without any revenues, which would have cost the American people in interest about 12 billion dollars over a period of ten years. Maybe there's a school program. If there is, I haven't seen any specific recommendations on it. Throughout all of these discussions I think you have to look behind words. Take the "prosperity" issue, for instance. I think we have prosperity in our country, but it's not the general spread that we would like to have. Let's examine the figures for a minute. Corporation profits this year are up 26%. The average worker's income is up only 7%. Corporation take-home pay is up 26%. The average person's take-home pay is up 3%. Stockholders' income is up 10%. Farmers income down 11%. Big business failures down 15%. Small business failures up 21%. I think that type of prosperity needs some examination.

SEN. CASE: Knowing how reasonable all these people are, including my Democratic colleagues, it is very difficult for me, as they sit back smiling after they have made their stabs and struck their blows, to get belligerent today and I don't think, as a matter of fact, the American people want that anyway. The American people, a long time, have trusted administrations -- not administrations which attempted to be controversial for the sake of being controversial -- but administrations which attempted to get things done; and to propose measures which were possible of enactment as opposed to presenting high-sounding programs which everybody knew didn't have a chance. Now, I'm not going to take up all these things in detail. Much of the reasonable approach that Hale Boggs just suggested is, of course, the right approach. It is true that the big accomplishments that we get done in this country in the field of foreign policy as well as in the field of domestic policy are bi-partisan. Otherwise, they wouldn't get done. And, nevertheless, I think it is proper to point out that the direction and leadership necessary to accomplish these things must come from somewhere and in this administration they have come from a man in the White House and his administration which has believed in doing things in the American way, and by that I don't mean to make any suggestion that anybody is subversive or anything else -- the American way being the way of steady progress at a pace which the people of this country will accept and will support and this has been done in the field, for instance, of civil rights. Everyone is agreed that there has been more progress made in actual accomplishment in this field under President Eisenhower's administration, than there has in dozens of years before this. And it has been done because this man believes that everybody -- regardless of the color of their skin or their race or anything else -- is a human being and entitled to equal treatment. He has brought them into his administration. He has cleared up segregation in the District of Columbia by executive order and by the force of his example. This accomplishment, Mr. Back and my colleagues, is something which no one here I know will question or challenge, and the same thing is true in many other fields.

Now, you take this question of farm policy. We do have an enormous problem of keeping the American farmer alive as an American institution, not just as a producer of commodities for us all to consume. It would be simple enough, and perhaps more economical in dollars, if we turned this whole thing over to big business to operate, if we wanted to do it that way. We don't want to do it -- neither Republicans nor Democrats. We want to keep it going in such a way that the small farmer stays in

existence because he is an enormous social asset to this country and we want to do it at some cost perhaps in dollars, but we want to do it in a way which will make it possible for him to continue as a free person and not operate under regimentation. And anybody who suggests that there is a simple, easy answer to that problem is simply defying facts. Now this administration doesn't claim that it has all the answers to all the problems or that it has always done a perfect job but in the farm problem, for instance, I would suggest -- and I don't think this can be denied -- that the surpluses that we find ourselves most troubled with now are the result of policies which were in existence for many years before this administration came into existence and it's done, I think, a commendable job in attempting to meet the problems. To suggest that because it has changed its position on certain specific measures over the years or over the months is only, I think, to say something which is commendatory rather than otherwise, because this is necessarily something in which we're all reaching for a solution. I think the soil bank proposals ought to be very seriously considered and I know that they will be.

We're going to get a program in agriculture. It's not going to be the result of a single party's action -- it's going to be the result of serious bi-partisan consideration. The same is true of many other features.

MR. BACK: Let's run around the table a minute and see what sort of a forecast you all make for a farm program in this session.

REP. ALBERT: The House of Representatives has passed a farm bill which would reinstate basic commodity support, 90%, and other features. This bill, I think, in perhaps modified form will be passed by the Senate and I think all of the recommendations of the administration will be seriously considered. I don't know what we'll do. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture has come up with a proposal for a great reforestation program. I have a feeling that there will be some form of agricultural legislation, the purpose of which will be designed to take land without hurting farmers, and particularly small farmers, on production which is now producing your surplus crops.

MR. BACK: I'd like to conclude on the subject of the farm and go on to the question of what this session is going to do on taxes.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: I believe that we should not have any further reductions of taxes. I think we could well have tax reform by eliminating some of the many loopholes which have been left in the tax bill inviting large income escape taxation. That's a very important matter, if we want to have a stable economy and if we want all classes of the people treated alike. Mr. Bogg's statistics, just given to us, cannot be attacked. They demonstrate that the rich are growing richer and the individuals who are engaged in agriculture and business are getting worse off. There can be no escape from that conclusion.

REP. BOGGS: As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have serious doubts about whether there will be any tax reduction. That bill would have to originate in the Ways and Means Committee. I might point out, however, that two years ago, in 1954, facing a deficit then of about \$2 billion, we reduced taxes about \$7 billion, and that reduction was very interesting because 73 cents out of each dollar went to the corporations -- 18 cents went to people earning more \$5,000 -- and 9 cents went to people earning below \$5,000.

REP. HILLINGS: I think the general consensus from the discussion so far is probably correct that there will be little likelihood of tax reduction this year because the number one goal is going to be to stabilize our government finances to balance the budget for the first time in years and that if we can do that and if, as a result of the growth of prosperity around the country, our present revenue estimates are exceeded when they actually come in by way of taxes, then there would be some possibility of tax relief but I think it is to the great credit of President Eisenhower and his Republican Administration that he has gone honestly to the country in his State of the Union message to explain what our objectives are in the fiscal field, balance the budget, cut down government expenses where it can be done without any sacrifice to our national defense program and that means, in the final analysis,

that the dollar is going to be worth more because inflation will continue to be checked and every working man will have a little bit more purchasing power in that dollar, as a result of this type of sensible and honest approach to our fiscal problems.

SEN. CASE: I welcome very much and appreciate the real statesmanship that the Democratic members of this panel have exhibited on this question of the balance of the budget and of the question of possible tax reduction this year. I think they are sound. I would put this qualification in for myself, and perhaps I speak for them also but we're not talking as the President in his message talked about the situation, assuming we continue our economy at a high level of activity where the picture might very well change and I assume or I wouldn't think that these men should be held to their statements that they think no tax reduction is likely this year, if the situation in that respect should change.

REP. BOGGS: I don't want to interrupt the Senator, but that's just Democratic doctrine that he's speaking.

SEN. CASE: I just want to point out that the President is the man who enunciated it in his message, and we all agree.

REP. SCOTT: May I interject this -- that I think that use of statistics is sometimes a little misleading to our audience because when my friend, Hale Boggs, mentioned that 9%, for example, of the tax reduction dollar goes to the people whose incomes are less than \$5,000, it ought to be pointed out that the man with the lower income got more proportionate relief than the man with the higher income, and if he got less in dollars it's because he, naturally, was a smaller income paying.....

REP. BOGGS: I don't want to disagree with my colleague, but I'm on the committee and the reduction was an across-the-board reduction so it couldn't have been more. It had to be less in the lower brackets.

REP. SCOTT: Actually, Hale, both tax reductions, the 80th Congress and the last one, operated in some cases to take some people off the roles entirely and in some cases, many cases, to reduce the amount paid by the man making the lowest income, greater in percentage than by the man making a higher income.

REP. ALBERT: I think it should be pointed out that the Democratic leadership, certainly in the House -- Speaker Rayburn has said that there should be no tax reduction unless we have a surplus, or unless the economy of the country, as Senator Case has pointed out, would require it. This is my position and the position of the majority in the House.

MR. BACK: Gentlemen, in your absence during adjournment, the school problem was dramatized here in Washington by the President's Conference on Education. I think everyone listening wants to know what sort of a forecast you will make with respect to federal aid to schools.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: For a long time many members of Congress, particularly in the Senate, Senator Hill, for example, have wanted to dedicate some of the oil income from offshore oil lands to the support of schools throughout the nation. Education is a national problem and it should be supported by the federal government. It's a national problem because in a steady degree, the sources of income have ceased to be those which were the sources of income when our government was first established, namely land and property upon the land. The sources of income now are the securities of the great corporations and that is a national source of tax revenue, so if we are going to have schools as we ought to do, we must make up our minds to tap the national revenue in a way that will make it possible for states which are no longer able to support the sort of schools that we must have in this modern age. That must be done. I am for the school construction program.

SEN. CASE: I join with Senator O'Mahoney in support of the school construction program. I have, for a long time, felt as many present members of the Senate and members of the House, too, have that the federal government had a role -- a necessary role -- in this field. Senator O'Mahoney mentioned Senator Hill and correctly so. He has been long interested in educational problems. He did not mention, and he left it properly to me to mention, that Senator Taft was one of the leaders with Senator

Hill in this field for a long time in the development together of a school aid bill. And members of the House as well as the Senate on both sides of the aisle have had similar proposals. It is a most difficult problem to get enacted into law because there are all kinds of serious questions. There are the honest questions on the part of people who very much believe that education should be controlled locally, in the communities, and that there is a danger in centralization of support because with it comes a danger of centralization of management and control.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: But I think we all agree that there should be no control from any central source.

SEN. CASE: I think there is no question about the agreement on that topic.

REP. HILLINGS: Senator, you may agree with that, but I'm afraid some of the leaders of your party don't agree with that.

SEN. CASE: I would think that we could almost say that everyone agrees that that ought to be the objective. There is a great difference as to whether certain approaches to it will result inevitably in that, and that's where the danger lies.

MR. BACK: I wonder if we could go on to some sort of a forecast. Has the Republican position changed on federal aid to schools?

SEN. CASE: I don't think you can say that there has been Republican opposition to this thing, any more than you can say there has been a strong crystallization up to now of party support on either side for it. You have always had individuals in both parties who have been for this thing and pressing strongly for it. I think that there is a majority feeling perhaps in both parties that the school construction program in a sound form ought to go through. That isn't to say that it's going through, though I hope it will because in addition to the serious question that people have had about this matter of control, there are collateral issues which plague us very deeply. The question of how you separate private and public schools and the degree to which aid can be given to public schools or to private schools and should be. And then there is the question which will undoubtedly rear its ugly head here -- of the effect of this thing on the policy enunciated so very soundly and correctly by the Supreme Court recently as to segregation. The practical difficulties here are going to make it necessary for the leadership in both parties and from the White House to be very strongly for the program that the President has outlined if we're going to get it through, and I hope very much that we will.

REP. SCOTT: I thought that we all understood that the Republican position is enunciated by President Eisenhower in the State of the Union message in which he said, "I urge that the Congress move promptly to enact an effective program of federal assistance to help erase the existing deficit of school classrooms." And he goes on to point out that that program must operate to increase rather than decrease local and state support of schools. Now, with reference to that, Senator Case has mentioned there is the very difficult question of segregation and I am bound to point out that the responsibility in the Congress is on the part of the Democrat majority and the chairman, and I want to express the hope that they will bring out a bill which flatly and candidly and honorably provides against any form of discrimination or segregation; and following that, I hope that this Democrat leadership will support for the first time a genuine civil rights program which will protect the Negroes' right to vote throughout the United States, and his right to be protected against violence.

REP. ALBERT: Regarding what my friend, Hugh Scott, has said, the House Committee on Labor and Education has reported out a bill, the Speaker of the House announcing at the first press conference that it would be the first major piece of legislation up for consideration. Now what the other members and myself of the House of Representatives will do with this Hale and I who are members of the Whip organization would like to know, because there are problems connected with the passage of this as there have been with all other pieces of major legislation and those problems come from both sides of the aisle.

REP. SCOTT: My comment was not what the Congress will do with it, but what the Democratic leadership will do about it. Will they grasp this nettle danger and come out with an honest bill which is against discrimination?

REP. BOGGS: Your comments are very interesting, particularly in light of Mr. Hillings' earlier comment when he interrupted Senator O'Mahoney and said that leadership in the Democratic Party was for centralized control on this bill and the truth is that if you want a bill passed, you know that if you write in the specifications that you want to write in, that the bill isn't going to be passed, so it's just a question of whether or not you want the bill passed or not. It's a question of whether you want the federal controls or not. Now, you've got a perfect formula for passing this bill if you want to use it. Senator O'Mahoney referred to the Hill-Burton Act in the field of -- I refer to the Hill-Burton Act, he referred to Senator Hill. The Hill-Burton Act in the field of medicine, in the field of hospitalization has been used to build hospitals all over these United States, and it has been used without any federal control of medicine. If you want to have federal control of education and vote for that kind of a bill, then you go ahead and vote for it.

REP. SCOTT: You're asserting, Hale, that if we want a bill passed, meaning we Republicans.....

REP. BOGGS: I'm not asserting anything of the kind. I am saying that if you have a school bill....

REP. HILLINGS: I want to ask Congressman Boggs if he's asking the Congress to defy the decision of the Supreme Court which is supposed to be the law of the land. He's saying that we might not have a bill on education if the segregation issue is raised. Now, Congressman Boggs, are you saying that the people of this country and the Congress should defy the Supreme Court and ignore the law?

REP. BOGGS: Congressman, I don't know what side of the argument you're on. A minute ago you interrupted Senator O'Mahoney and now you want to write into the law all kinds of prohibitions.

REP. HILLINGS: On the contrary. I'm having difficulty interpreting your position. Our position is basically there must be assistance in construction, perhaps in teachers' salaries to the schools, but there must be no bureaucrat sitting in Washington telling the people what they can teach in the local schools. I also say that we're going to follow the law of the land as enunciated by the Supreme Court.

SEN. CASE: I think it is only fair, and not to attempt to aggravate or exacerbate this difficult problem, but it's only fair to point out, it seems to me, that Pat Hillings here is right when he distinguishes between control of education -- what is taught and who teaches it -- and the question of whether federal aid should be given or withheld on the basis of whether a state or a community is following the Supreme Court decision in regard to segregation. Now, I don't think we can settle this problem here today. I think we've done our duty, perhaps, by raising it and pointing out the difficulty and perhaps the way the various sections of the country and perhaps, to some degree, the parties will line up on it. The problem is a tough one and I do hope that we will be able, in the Democratic leadership, to find enough force and enough ingenuity to cross the barriers which are splitting their party on this difficult and vital question and get actual results.

REP. BOGGS: I'm certain that those same speeches will be made in the South during the election campaign.

MR. BACK: May I close the question of schools now, because of time, and turn to foreign aid and, once again, Senator O'Mahoney, may I ask you for your forecast for '56 on foreign aid spending?

SEN. O'MAHONEY: Again, it's a very difficult thing to make a forecast upon foreign aid, as upon any other subject which was brought here today. I must remark again that if this Congress is to accomplish anything, it must lay aside completely the tendency which has been displayed here in this discussion to resort to partisan arguments upon issues which are essentially non-partisan. I remember the time, if I may indulge just a moment in what may be a comparison -- when the Democratic Party and the Democratic leadership was denounced for bringing the welfare state. Now I

think that as a Democrat, I can count on Mr. President and those on the Republican side who will support him on the steps he is taking apparently to give us the welfare state. But I call attention to the fact that at least ten times in the President's message he said that the program would be submitted later. We don't know yet what the program is with respect to highways....

REP. HILLINGS: We'll know in just a couple of days, Senator.

SEN. O'MAHONEY: I doubt it very much, Sir. I doubt it very much -- whether we will know in just a couple of days because I know of the wide division that there is on both sides with respect to some of the fundamentals. With respect to foreign aid, I am personally very much of the opinion that the policy of the Congress should be to emphasize and strengthen economic aid but it should be carried on by the people in the countries to be aided, and not by the government of the United States as such. I very much think we ought to reduce the amount of military aid given to foreign countries which may eventually be used against us.

REP. HILLINGS: I am convinced, as President Eisenhower has enunciated, that we must continue to help our friends abroad who are willing to help themselves in the fight against communism. We do have to have an adequate administration of that aid. Unfortunately, in some years past some of it has been wasted because of inadequate administration. We believe the type of leadership President Eisenhower has brought to the foreign field will mean that money will be more wisely spent in the future and it can be a helpful factor in stemming the tide against the advance of communism.

MR. BACK: There will be a request for more money for foreign aid than some of you had anticipated, is that right?

REP. HILLINGS: No, I think that was a garbled report. Actually it was for additional authorization over future years, but the increased spending in foreign aid in this coming fiscal year will be only a fraction higher than it was in the previous years.

REP. BOGGS: That's a very interesting observation. For three years around here we heard about these previous commitments that had been made. Now we're going to commit \$3 billion over a period of time to be spent in future years.

REP. ALBERT: I think the President's request for military aid will probably be granted. I think his request for Point IV money will be granted. I have my doubts, though I've always supported it, that all of his requests for economic aid will be granted by the present Congress.

REP. SCOTT: Military and economic aid alike are forms of insurance of our own survival and I think we'll have bi-partisan support. With regard to some countries, such as India, I think we ought to be very, very careful about the aid we extend unless we make sure that the Indians, for example, acknowledge it to the people of their own country the way they acknowledge the meagre kind of Russian assistance.

SEN. CASE: Very briefly I want to point this out -- in opposition to the suggestion that there has been no leadership in this field -- this is a case where the President has exercised strong leadership. I think we must continue foreign aid, both military and economic. We should endeavor to make it more effective by increased local administration and understanding -- but the atoms for peace thing, the Geneva Conference operations, all the rest of these things, including the foreign aid understanding that the President has are the best examples, it seems to me, of real leadership in this most difficult field.

MR. BACK: My thanks to all of you for your appearance on this panel -- Senators Case and O'Mahoney, and House members Hugh Scott, Carl Albert, Hale Boggs and Patrick Hillings. Our thanks to the staffs of the Senate Radio Gallery and Station WMAL, ABC in Washington.